

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

An adjourned regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Mary Lee Rosenbaum at 7:02 p.m., **Wednesday, February 16, 2005**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair
Randy Neff, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Charles Umeda
Rene Sakala

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Deborah Woldruff, Community Development Director
Cathy Johnson, Senior Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Dept.
Raul Colunga, Assistant Planner

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no public participation

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-05-08 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NOS. 02-02 AND 02-05, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NOS. 02-02 AND 02-05, SPECIFIC PLAN (SP) NOS. 02-08 AND 02-13 (UNIVERSITY VILLAGE AND ORCHARD PARK)

Senior Planner Cathy Johnson gave a brief staff report stating that the Planning Commission had continued the item from the February 2, 2005, and reserved this meeting for the consideration of the entire Orchard Park Specific Plan document.

She continued to say that at the February 2, 2005 meeting, the Planning Commission discussed written comments prepared by Chairperson Rosenbaum and Commissioner Umeda and public testimony regarding the University Village Specific Plan. The Commissioners also agreed to

redline and submit their copies of the Specific Plan to City Staff by February 24, 2005 in order to provide more input to the applicant about their concerns.

Mr. Guy Ferris, KTGy Arch Group, 501 Begonia Ave, Corona del Mar, CA addressed the Commission and explained that the applicant was seeking input to make a well-ordered transition from high intensity at Redlands Boulevard to a rural density along Mission Road. He spoke of the guiding principals of new urbanism, and stated that they must demonstrate respect for the community and provide a balance between land use & activities. He continued to say that their goals were to give priority to public spaces, create diverse neighborhoods, and provide integration and connectivity of uses. He added that they would accomplish this by establishing a walkable community making recreational activities and commercial uses available within a ¼ mile, five-minute walk from the neighborhoods, giving consideration to surrounding land uses and housing needs in the community, ensuring connectivity with the existing street system, and finally preserving of onsite historic resources.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period.

Dean Horinouchi, 25743 Mariposa Street, Loma Linda cited the cost of housing and benefits to the community as his reasons for speaking in favor of the project.

Yoshi Mineyama, 24930 Mound Street #6, Loma Linda stated that people needed to be close to the hospital and that church members of the Japanese SDA church would most likely change to the Mission Road SDA Church.

Richard Kunihiro, 26433 Margarita Lane, Loma Linda stated that he was one of close to 80 property owners of Cal-88 and explained that they were keeping in mind the concerns the residents have with density, maintaining the high standards that Loma Linda was accustomed to and were trying to do their part to counteract urban sprawl.

Richard Wysong, 26083 Brookmere Ave, Loma Linda explained that he worked at Loma Linda University and that his colleagues could not afford to live in Loma Linda. He said that this type of project was very attractive and opened possibilities of living close to where they worked.

James Morita, 11543 Murphy Street, Loma Linda addressed the Commission and stated that as a senior citizen he liked the overall plan because of the proximity of the senior housing to churches and shopping.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, Loma Linda stated that a business use with this type of density in an Agriculture Use zone was not in conformance with the Loma Linda Municipal Code. He added that the project was not really a neo-traditional or a livable/walkable development and added this was the wrong place in the city to try this because of the increase in traffic and felt that a high school was needed for the future. He concluded stating that the citizens of Loma Linda were not ready for this type of project and that the Planning Commission should be looking at preserving more open space and some of the orange groves.

Dan Kunihiro, 25522 Allen Way, Loma Linda, stated that their project was on the right track to resolve the issue of the lack of housing in Loma Linda.

Georgia Hodgkins, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda stated that the row house concept did not respect the current image of the Loma Linda community and that the proposed two-story housing for seniors was not appropriate. She continued to say that the currently approved

projects were adding approximately 3000 housing units therefore proposing 1769 more dwelling units on 138 acres showed a lack of respect for the City of Loma Linda. Ms. Hodgkins stated that she would like to see signage identifying the area as a historic district, and added that the proposed projects did not respect or conform to the Historic Mission Overlay Ordinance.

Kathy Glendrange, 26551 Beaumont Avenue, Loma Linda, stated that the proposal did not meet the 5-acre per 1000 of population as required by the park standard. She continued to say that SCAG recommended an increase of approximately 200 units per year and that Loma Linda had double the number of units of multi-family housing compared to San Bernardino County and commented that the densities were far too high.

Savat Khaunphoa, 33578 Brushsky Yellow Drive, Yucaipa commented that we could not stop progress and that the project seemed to be a very well planned design trying to accommodate today and tomorrow's future growth.

Robert Horner, 3981 Holly Spring Drive, Corona stated that he came to Loma Linda in 1948 to study medicine, that he was a property owner in Cal-88, and thrilled about the plan that was being proposed.

David Werner, 11469 Campus Street, Loma Linda stated that he was excited to see this project that had a cosmopolitan approach to the community. He said that he liked to support the community, and that this area was at a crossroads of what was the City was going to do with the limited available resources. He continued to say that the City needed to set an example regarding the challenge of public transportation and that the Planning Commission would be called upon to implement into the community a mass transit plan that was accessible and available.

David Fukuda, 11216 Rosarita Drive, Loma Linda, stated that he was physician. He continued to comment that the City of Loma Linda had been presented with an opportunity to build a community in this area, to celebrate its past as an orange grove and a Native American community.

Don Schatzschneider, 22420 Ladera Street, Grand Terrace also addressed the Commission but his comments were not recorded.

The discussion of the Planning Commission covered the following:

- The necessity for the City to work with Redlands Unified School District to identify the locations for elementary and middle schools;
- Historic Mission Overlay District – Applicant stated that they were cognizant of being in the District and their plan included the preservation of the oak trees and several historic structures on site;
- Interior Streets – Applicant pointed out that not all the streets were shown at the Specific Plan level;
- New urbanism – Applicant stated that they were planning a community with a transit element;
- Housing costs.

Chair Rosenbaum pointed out to the Commission that their role was to concentrate on the best use of the land in the City of Loma Linda. Commissioner Sakala commented that her kids would

never get to experience the orange blossom scents in springtime if development continued at the current pace.

The discussion continued and addressed the following topics:

- Chair Rosenbaum stated that she wanted to see a mixed use that would actively promote a live/ work environment, which was a very healthy type of use in the City and that she was encouraged to see that the applicant's project included a senior component although she was concerned with commercial uses being so far from the senior housing;
- Commissioner Sakala reiterated the fact that the project did not follow the Historic Mission Overlay District Ordinance guidelines, that she liked the church, and that there was no density numbers shown for senior housing;
- Public transit system – Vice Chair Neff commented that it would be quite valuable to circulate a public transportation plan for the project linking the project with the medical center and downtown Loma Linda with bus loops to tie-in with changes of shifts at the Medical Center;
- The challenge of the preservation of the oak trees;
- Trail connectivity;
- Setback for residential development to preclude Planned Community projects;
- Single story units – Chair Rosenbaum commented that there needed to be a variation in height and masses of the houses;
- Trees – Chair Rosenbaum requested that 24-inch box trees be required for the minimum tree size;
- House Design – Commissioner Sakala stated that she would like to see designs other than Spanish and bungalow craftsman being proposed.

Mr. Holland quickly addressed some of the Planning Commission comments. He agreed that the underlying question was traffic and that they were planning to put in a transit node that would also serve Loma Linda University. On the question of setbacks, he explained that they varied depending on housing style. On Commissioner Sakala's comment regarding the Spanish style design, he pointed out that the style would represent a maximum of 15 - 20% of the project.

Director Woldruff commented that if the Planning Commissioners would note in their copy of the Specific Plan the changes they would like to see, she would compile the comments and provide them to the Commissioners for their review.

Motion Rosenbaum, seconded by Sakala, and unanimously carried to continue the meeting to March 16, 2005.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were no reports by Commissioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff did not provide a report.

The meeting was adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

Minutes approved at the meeting of August 3, 2005.

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2005\02-16-05M-app.doc